

REMARKS

I. Claim Rejections - §103

Claims 1-6 and 9 are rejected as being obvious from prior art cited in the application at pages 2 and 3 in view of Levine et al. (US 6,327,501).

Levine is directed to a system for determining safety alert conditions for implantable medical devices. The system automatically performs a comparison of identification data with a safety alert advisory and stores identification data. An external programmer retrieves the identification data and automatically cross-correlates the data with the safety alert advisories. Upon identification of a match between the data and one of the safety alert advisories, the identified safety alert advisory is displayed to a medical practitioner.

The present invention is directed to a portable extender adapted for use by a visiting nurse. Nowhere does Levine mention such a device. Moreover, amended claim 1 is specific in reciting the inclusion of computer implemented software for planning and organizing a daily schedule of patient visits for the visiting nurse among a plurality of patients.

Support for this limitation is found in the Summary of the Invention at page 4 and in the preamble of original claim 10.

It follows that dependent claims 2-6 and 9 are also patentable over the combination that includes Levine.

Claim 7 was rejected as being obvious from the combination, including Levine, as applied in rejecting claim 1, together with Dussell et al. Claim 8 was rejected as being obvious from the combination, including Levine, as applied in rejecting claim 1, together with Black and Schoenberg.

The contention is that the prior art cited in the application and Dussell provide teachings of a GPS to enable the nurse to plot a sequence of patient visits. The prior art, however, only says that a GPS can be included to give directions. There is no mention of the ability for planning and organizing a daily schedule of patient visits for the visiting nurse among a plurality of patients.

Similarly, Dussell is only directed to a position based personal digital assistant (PDA) within a vehicle. A task description is stored in a database accessible by a mobile computer system. The mobile computer system receives positioning information corresponding to its geographic location and indexes the database based on the positioning information when the information indicates that the mobile computer system is in a geographic location that facilitates completion of a task associated with the task description. The task description preferably includes a geocode which corresponds to the geographic location at which completion of the task may be facilitated. The task description may also include textual, voice or other message which can be displayed and/or played back to a user. The positioning information may be obtained from a GPS satellite. Dussell provides only a framework for getting among various geographic locations. Thus, even combining Dussell with the other prior art, including Levine, fails to result in the combination set forth in claim 7.

Claims 7 and 8 set forth subject matter as a whole which would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art from the combination of Levine together with Dussell or together with Black and Schoenberg.

Claims 10-14, like claim 7, are rejected on a combination of references that includes Levine and Dussell. Therefore, as with claim 7, claims 10-14 set forth subject matter as a whole which would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The obviousness rejections of the pending claims are without merit and should be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims present a novel and non-obvious combination of features over the prior art. As such, all claims are patentable over the prior art cited and the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

April 18, 2006
Date

/Michael C. Soldner/
Michael C. Soldner
Reg. No. 41,455
(763) 514-4842
Customer No. 27581